

### AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached new sheet of drawings includes a replacement drawing for FIG. 1. Fig. 1 finds support in Claim 1 as originally filed.

**Attachment:** 1 Replacement Sheet of Drawing

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **24 January 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Examiner objected to the specification because of informalities. Examiner rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Examiner rejected claims 1-21 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of co-pending Application No. 10/682,946. Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Jimenez et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0006124 hereinafter “Jimenez”). Examiner rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Jimenez, and Takagi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,695 hereinafter “Takagi”).

### **Objections to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a)**

The drawings were objected to as not showing a telephony controller in claims 1, 8, and 15. Applicant has added a replacement sheet to the drawings, and respectfully submits that this in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). No new matter has been added.

### **Objections to the Specification**

Applicant has amended paragraph [0002] of the specification. Applicant has also amended paragraph [0025] of the specification with respect to the replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 1 (see above), clarifying that telephony controller 100 includes the SIP framework 102. This finds support in original claim 2 of the instant application. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the objections. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 15-21, directing the claims to a computer-readable storage **device**, and respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. This finds support in paragraph [0024] of the specification.

### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-21 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/682,946. Applicant notes that Application No. 10/682,946 has been issued a notice of allowance on 12 February 2008 as USPN. 7,330,899.

Applicant respectfully submits the attached terminal disclaimer with respect to the above prior patent, USPN 7,330,899, to obviate any provisional or actual rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

### **Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Examiner rejected claims 1-14 based on Jimenez et al., and has rejected claims 15-21 based on Jimenez and Takagi et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Jimenez discloses a telephony interface module **with a audio data buffer** (see Jimenez, item 150a in FIGs 3a and 3c, and paragraph [0033]) This audio data buffer is used in Jimenez to receive and buffer requested audio data for transmission to the user.

In contrast, the embodiments of the present invention use a SIP servlet container that contain one or more currently registered SIP servlets (see paragraph

[0027] and FIG. 1, item 108 of the instant application). It is well known in the art that **SIP servlets are programs used to provide particular services for applications to take advantage of.** Using a SIP container containing a variety of registered SIP servlets is beneficial because embodiments of the present invention provide a telephony controller that can be used in a unified telephony solution by enabling the controller to comprise SIP servlets that can be registered to the SIP container, and to be used for a variety of telephony applications. Applicant respectfully submits that **the SIP servlet container is not a simple audio data buffer** as disclosed in Jiminez. Applicant also respectfully submits that it is not possible to use the system of Jiminez and Takagi to deploy services provided by a variety of SIP servlets leading to a unified telephony solution.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the telephony controller includes a SIP framework with a SIP servlet container that includes registered SIP servlets for interfacing with a SIP network. This finds support in paragraph [0027] and FIG. 1, item 108 of the instant application. Dependent claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-21 have been amended to reflect correct claim dependencies in light of the above amendments to the independent claims. Dependent claims 2, 9, and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15, as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-6, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.  
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/  
Shun Yao  
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 24 April 2008

Shun Yao  
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1667  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: shun@parklegal.com